



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VII.—*On Some Ancient and Modern Etymologies.*

BY PROF. MINTON WARREN,

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

Periero and *peiero* have long puzzled scholars. Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 199, says: "*Pejĕro* and *ĕjĕro* (cf. *conierat*, *coniurat*, *G.G.L.* IV. 322, 33) have not yet been thoroughly explained." See also p. 587. More recently Ferdinand Sommer, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, Bd. XI. (1900), p. 56, says: "Sehr zweifelhaft ist *pĕierare* (Osthoff, *Perfekt*, S. 115 Anm.) das, falls es zu *peior* gehört, auch die Vokalstufe **pĕiōs*- enthalten könnte; das Wort ist und bleibt eine *crux*; auch die Ausführungen von Stolz (*H.G.* 170) befriedigen nicht."

Before Osthoff, Alcuin had connected *peiero* with *peius*, but in a different way, cf. Keil, *G.L.* VII., p. 307. "*Periurus qui male iurat, peiero vero verbum r non debet habere; est enim quasi peius iuro.*" This was doubtless a current popular etymology, which did not lose sight of the connection of the word with *iuro*. Osthoff, in 1884, explained *peiero* as a denominative from *peius* in the original sense of "entstellen, verhunzen." In 1885 Gustav Meyer, *Zeits. für Oest. Gym.* 36, p. 280, gave a similar explanation. Brugmann, *Gdr.* II., p. 402, admits the explanation as possible. L. Havet, *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique*, VI., p. 22, without mentioning Osthoff, gives essentially his view. "*Peierare* signifie donc à l'origine 'rendre pire, altérer, fausser, violer.' *Ius peieratum* est un droit corrompu (par faux serment). L'étymologie populaire crut voir dans ce dérivé de *peius* un composé de *per* et de *iūro*, doctrine qui ne paraît pas conciliable avec les lois phonétiques." Wharton, in his *Etyma Latina* (1890), has "*pĕjero*, swear falsely; 'make worse, alter, violate,' fr. *pĕjes*- (cf. *mājestas* beside *mājor*)." Despite this array of authority, it seems to me that there is very little to

be said for this explanation. It disregards the fact that *perierare* is better attested than *peierare* in Plautus, and ignores the fact that such denominatives from comparatives are of late development in the history of the Latin language. Moreover, it is difficult to believe that *deiero*, which is found in Plautus, although evidently a compound of *iuro*, owes its *e* solely to the analogy of *peiero*. A common explanation must be found, I think, for *periero*, *deiero*, *eiero*, and the form *conierat* (*coierat*) found only in Glossaries and explained as *coniurat*. The difficulty of course is in accounting for the short *e* in these compounds, and I do not think it is met by assuming, with Stolz, the existence of a primitive verb *iūro* with short *u* alongside of *iūro*.

Before proceeding to state my view, I shall speak briefly of the forms found in Plautus: There are some sixteen cases of the verb *periuro* (*periero*) in Plautus, in three of which the reading is disputed. Only seven of these passages are found in the Ambrosianus, namely, Cist. 500, Merc. 539, Poen. 480, 1242, Pseud. 354, 1057, Stich. 192. In all except the last of these passages A has the spelling with *u*. In Stich. 192,

ni vere perierit, si cenassit domi,

Bugge would read *perieraverit*, but Leo takes *perierit* in the sense of *interierit*. In Poen. 1242, A has *periures* with the other Mss. where the metre requires *perieres*. In two other passages not found in A, Bacch. 1030 and 1042, the best Mss. have *periurem* and *periuret* where the metre requires the form with *ē*. *Perierat* is well attested for As. 293. There are nine passages where, so far as the metre is concerned, forms with *e* might be substituted for the better attested forms with *u*. Moreover, in Stich. 229, A alone has *perieratiunculas*, the other Mss. having *periuratiunculas*. It is quite possible, therefore, that *periero* was the more common form in Plautus, and that *periuro* has been substituted for it not simply in the three passages where the metre requires *periero*. The forms found are *periuras* Poen. 480, *perieras* Ussing, Leo, *perierat* As. 293. *Peierat* Men. 814 without Ms. authority Schoell. The Mss. read *delurat* or *delirat*, and Leo reads *deierat*.

Perierant Truc. 30 Schoell. *Perierandum* Leo and GS., *periurabo* As. 322, *periuravisti* Pseud. 354, *periuravit* Merc. 539. *Perieraverit*? or *perierit* Stich. 192. *Perierem* Bacch. 1030, *periurem* BCDFZ, *pericres* Poen. 1242, *periures* A with other Mss., *perieret* Bacch. 1042. *Periuret* Mss., *periuraris* As. 562 and 570, *periuraverint* Curc. 268, *periurare* Cist. 500 and Pseud. 1057.

For the existence of the form without *r*, *peiero*, the evidence is very slight for Plautus, although it is occasionally found in FZ and has been introduced by editors (cf. the critical apparatus to Asin. 293, Bacch. 1042, Poen. 480 and 1242, Pseud. 1057, Truc. 30). The adjective *peiurus* and the noun *peiurium* are somewhat better attested. See Studemund, *Rhein. Mus.* 21, 588.

The explanation, which I have to propose, starts from the form IOVESTOD of the Stele recently discovered in the Forum, which, with Hülsen, Skutsch, Thurneysen, and other scholars, I regard as the earlier form of *iustod*, *iusto*.

In *I.F.* XI., p. 342, v. Grienberger explains *iovesat* at the beginning of the Duenos inscription as equal to *iurat*, translating "es schwört bei den Göttern, der mich sendet." I do not think that this makes good sense, and v. Grienberger himself admits his inability to establish the connection with what follows.¹

Yet I think every one must admit that the earlier form of *iurat* would have been *iovesat*, which by syncopation gave *iousat* and then by rhotacism *iourat*. The diphthong *ou* is abundantly attested in inscriptions.

In the compound verb the phonetic development was somewhat different. In the early period the accent would of course rest upon the preposition. Now, just as *dénovo* gives *dénuo*, *éndovo* *induo* (cf. Umb., *anovihimu*), *túpover tú puer* (cf. *Archiv*, XII., p. 281), so *périovero* would give *périuero*, or, in the stage before rhotacism, *périoveso* would have given *périueso*. One further change took place.

¹ I have attempted, *Harvard Studies*, XI. 164, reading *ioveset*, to explain this as the older form of *iouset*, *iussit*, an explanation which also rests indirectly on the assumption that *iovestod* equals *iustod*.

Minerva is now explained (cf. Brugmann, *Gdr.* I.,² pp. 232, 319, 324) as coming from **menes-oua* through *menesua*, *Minerua*, *Minerva*, *larva* as from *lasua*, **lasoua*. So I think in *periuero*, resulting from *periovero*, there was a tendency to pronounce the vowel *u* as *v* (English *w*), but the difficulty of pronouncing *v* after consonantal *i* caused the *u* to drop out. Thus we get instead of *periuero*, *periero*, and similarly in *eiero* and *deiero*. By this theory the short *e* is fully explained, and there is no necessity to dissociate *peiero* from *iuro* on the one hand or from *eiero* and *deiero* on the other.

The dropping of *v(u)* after a consonant is seen in *aperio*, *operio* for *apverio*, *opverio*, cf. Brugmann, *I.F.* I., p. 175, in *battere* for *battuere*, *battalia* for *battualia*, cf. *Archiv*, I., p. 249 and X., p. 421, and Schuchardt, *Vocalismus*, II., p. 470. The Appendix Probi, *Archiv*, XI., p. 329 has *februarius non febrarius*. See the note of Heraeus. *Februarius* is abundantly attested in inscriptions and has its descendant in the Italian *Febbraio*. It is found also in a papyrus of the first century, first published in 1900.¹ Schuchardt gives (II., p. 467 f.) many examples of *u* dropped in vulgar Latin. So *Ianarius* for *Ianuarius*, *Conflentis* for *Confluentes*, which gives us the modern Coblenz.

An interesting English parallel is seen in *swear* = *iuro*, whereas in the compound *answer* the *w*, although written, is not pronounced.

As to the form *peiero*, which seems not to be clearly established for Plautus, but which is frequent enough in later Latin (see Georges, *Lexikon der Lat. Wortformen*, s.v.), I should explain the dropping of the *r* as due to the same causes which have led to its disappearance in *praestigiae*, *crebescere*, and other words. A form like *perierare* or *perieraris* with three successive *r*'s was difficult to pronounce, but neither the second nor the third *r* could be dropped without making the form unintelligible and consequently the first was dropped. Cf. Grammont, *La Dissimulation consonantique*, p. 28. The forms *deierare* and *eierare* may also have contributed to the disappearance of the *r*, which was further helped on by a popular etymology connecting the word with *peius*.

¹ *Archives Militaires du 1^{er} Siècle*, Jules Nicole et Charles Morel, Genève, 1900.

As to the form *periurare* little need be said. It is simply due to recomposition, to bring out more clearly the connection with *iuro*, at a period when the form *periero* had already become a little mysterious. So in Curc. 268 *periuraverint* follows *in iure iurando* of the line before, and in Pseud. 354 *periuravisti* takes up *iuravistin* of 352.

In the compounds *abiuro* and *adiuro*, only the forms with *u* are attested for Plautus. See Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*,¹ Fasc. I. So too in the case of *coniuro* although *conierat* is attested by glossaries. Editors read *deieravit*, Cas. 670 and *deiera*, Rud. 1336, although in the latter passage the Mss. have *deiura*. *Eiero* is not attested for Plautus, but occurs in later writers. *Exiuro* is found in a fragment of the Amph. For examples of *periero*, *peiero*, *deiero*, *eiero* in writers later than Plautus and in Inscriptions, see Georges, *Lex. der Lat. Wortformen*.

SOROR AND FRATER.

From Gellius, XIII. 10 we learn that the jurist Antistius Labeo derived *soror* from *seorsum*, and that Nigidius Figulus derived *frater* from *fere alter*, "*frater est dictus quasi fere alter*." Labeo and Nigidius were purists. They both believed in explaining Latin words from the Latin. Their etymologies are indefensible, but from another point of view they may have a certain interest and value. In deriving *soror* from *seorsum* Labeo evidently had in view the shorter form *sorsum*, which is found in Plautus and Lucretius.

The derivation of *frater* from *fere alter* implies a possible pronunciation of *frater* as *ferater* with the insertion of a parasitic *e*. Now it is quite possible that some persons should insert an *e* between *f* and *r* in pronunciation, when they would not do so in writing, just as Édon, *Écriture et Prononciation du Latin savant et du Latin populaire*, p. 213, tells us that a Persian will pronounce *français* *ferançais*. So we find in inscriptions *Terebonio* and *Terebuni* for the usual *Trebonius*, cf. *C.I.L.* I. 190, and *Ephem. Epig.* I., p. 29, n. 116. Other

¹ It is quite possible that these are later compounds formed when *iuro* was the only form in use of the simple verb.

similar examples of the same tendency given by Édon are *Alexandiri*, *Petiro*, *patiri*, *matiribus*, *materi*, *Geracilis* for *Gracilis*, *pateres*, *magisteres*, *arbiterio*, *teribunatu*, to which others might be added. The same possibility seems to be indicated by Varro's derivation of *Gracchus* from *gero* (cf. Charisius Keil, *G.L.* I., p. 87), although Wölfflin's recent derivation from *gracus*, the primitive of *graculus*, is more plausible. Servius and Donatus do not hesitate to derive *ars* from ἀρτεῖν, suggesting that the nom. pl. may have sounded like *aretes*. Paulus, p. 10, gives as one derivation of *atrium* "*quod a terra oriatur quasi aterrium*." Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.*, p. 93, following Meyer-Lübke, says that the development in Romance of a word like *patrem* suggests an almost trisyllabic pronunciation like *paterem*, and the Venerable Bede tried to do away with spondaic hexameters ending in words like *respergebat*, *argenti* by assuming a pronunciation *resperigebat*, *arigenti*, which reminds us at once of the anaptyctic vowel in Oscan in words like *aragetud*. A tendency of this sort in Latin can hardly be denied.

For the dropping of *l* before *t* there is little that we can compare in Latin, but in Oscan in this very word *l* is dropped in the *Tabula Bantina*, which has *atrud* for *altrud*, although elsewhere in Oscan the *l* is preserved in the few instances where the word occurs. Similarly the Umbrian drops *l* in *motar*, which corresponds to Lat. *multa*, fine, cf. von Planta, I., p. 299. In French of course *alter* becomes *autre*, but in some of the Romance dialects the *l* seems to have been totally lost. Thus Sardinian has *atter*, *atteru*, Calabrian *atru* and *atu*, Genoese *aotro* and *atro*, cf. Mohl, *Introduction à la Chronologie du Latin Vulgaire*, p. 278. It seems to me, then, that in giving the derivation of *frater* from *fere alter*, Nigidius may well have had in mind a dialectic pronunciation of *alter* in which the *l* was not distinctly heard.¹

¹ We are not informed as to the birthplace of Nigidius Figulus, but it is perhaps interesting to note in this connection that the gentile name Nigidius is found according to Conway especially in Campanian and Sabine areas, *i.e.* exactly in those regions where *l* before *t* was not distinctly heard. Cf. Conway, *Italic Dialects*, II., p. 576.

The fact that Nigidius did derive *frater* from *fere alter* may lend support to the view that in the expression *dies ater*, *ater* stands for an original *alter*. Mohl, p. 277, says: "Que **ātru* ou **atru* pour **altrum alterum* ait circulé dans l'Italie du Sud dès une époque très ancienne, c'est ce que montre le latin *dies ater*, Varron, *Ling. Lat.*, VI. 4, 29: *Dies postridie Kalendas Nonas Idus appellati atri, quod per eos dies novi inciperent*. L'expression *dies ater* signifie donc 'un jour d'une nouvelle serie, d'une autre division.' Le mot nous reporte sans doute à l'époque où les Campaniens étaient encore les éducateurs de Rome, peut-être même au temps où Numa y introduisait le calendrier sabin." Before Mohl, Deecke had explained *ater* in the same way, but had attributed it to Etruscan influence. In *Die Falisker* (1888), p. 90, he says: "Es ist nämlich *ater* die etruskische Form für lat. *alter*, mit Wegfall des *l* vor *t*, wie im Beinamen *hatu* neben *haltu*, *faltu* lat. *Falto*." Mohl's view seems to me more probable. Wissowa in the article on *dies ater* in the new Pauly admits a similar meaning for *ater*. I quote his words: "Der Name *dies ater* hat mit *ater*, 'schwarz' nichts zu thun, sondern hängt, wie O. Gruppe (*Herm.* XV. 624) richtig gesehen hat, zusammen mit den Bildungen *Triatrus*, *Quinquatrus*, *Septimatrus* d.h. *post diem tertium*, *quintum*, *septimum* (Varro, *de l. l.* VI. 14. Fest. p. 254, die nur darin irren dass sie *Quinquatrus* etc. deuten *post diem quintum* etc. *Idus*, während natürlich der Ausgangspunkt der Zahlung jeder beliebige sein kann), bedeutet also nichts anderes als eben *dies postridianus*." Gruppe in the article referred to by Wissowa makes no attempt to connect *ater* with *alter*. He says: "Ueber den Ursprung des Wortes vermag ich eine Vermuthung nicht aufzustellen; was den Sinn betrifft, so scheint mir am wahrscheinlichsten, dass es etwa 'nach,' 'nachher' bedeutete." Deecke, however, op. cit., p. 91, says: "*triatrus*, ursprünglich wohl nach der zweiten Deklination, für **tri-alter(us)*, eigentlich der 'drei-andere' d.i. 'drittnächste' Tag u.s.w." We have the distinct testimony of Festus to the fact that *Triatrus*, *Sexatrus*, and *Septematrus* were in use among the Tusculans and *Decimatrus* among the Faliscans. These words, therefore, were dialectic

and there is nothing to prevent our supposing that *Quinquatrus* was originally a dialectic form. I submit, therefore, that in view of Nigidius' etymology of *frater* and of the facts above stated in regard to *alter*, this etymology of Deecke's deserves more serious attention than it has received from scholars. Stolz, *Historische Grammatik*, p. 549, without any attempt to explain the intrusion of the *r*, connects the suffix *-atrus* with the suffix *-atus*. His words are "Weiter reiht sich hier auch an *trīm-ātu-s* (Analogiebildung nach *prīm-ātu-s* Varro u.a.) 'Alter von drei Jahren' Col. Plin., das zugleich auch den Schlüssel enthält für *Quīnqu-ātrū-s* (**quīnqu-ātu-s* 'Feier am fünften Tage') und die von Festus 340 Th. d. P. aufgeführten entsprechenden Bildungen *Decim-ātrū-s* (faliskisch) und *Septem-ātrū-s*, *Sex-ātrū-s*, *Tri-ātrū-s* (tusculanisch)." After this explanation, which does not explain, he coolly dismisses Deecke's view with the words "Eine andere sicher unhaltbare Vermuthung über diese Substantive findet man bei Deecke Die Falisker S. 90 f." Deecke is doubtless wrong in what he says about Etruscan influence, but not I think in connecting the words with *alter*, although there still remains some difficulty in regard to the declension of these forms. The most plausible supposition would be that *Quinquatrus* was influenced in its declension by *Idus*, *Idus* itself being an old adjective with a *u*-stem, cf. Brugmann, *Gdr.* II., p. 297. Compare also Sanskrit *trīr aktūn* and Delbrück, *Vergleichende Syntax*, I., p. 163.

In connection with Nigidius' etymology of *frater*, it may be interesting to note that Cicero, in *Ad fam.* II. 15, speaks of his brother Quintus as his *alter ego*. "*quem tamen si reliquissem, dicerent iniqui non me plane post annum, ut senatus voluisset, de provincia decessisse, quoniam alterum me reliquissem.*" Voss, in his *Etymologicon*, goes so far as to say that in writing this, Cicero had in mind the etymology of Nigidius, but this is unnecessary. That *alter* and *ater* are often confused in Mss. I need not note. A famous example is Catullus, XCIII. 2,

nec scire utrum sis albus an ater homo,

where all the Mss. have *alter* for *ater*.

SALTEM.

Gellius, XII. 14, gives two etymologies for *saltem*, with both of which he declares himself unsatisfied, "*censuimus igitur amplius quaerendum.*" The second derivation makes *saltem* stand for *salutem*, with the extrusion of *u*. This seemed to Gellius clever but far-fetched. That it was current in antiquity is shown by the fact that Donatus and Servius both give it. Cf. Donatus, *ad Adel.* II. 2, 41 and Servius, *ad Aen.* IV. 327. This etymology need not be seriously considered. The other I give in the words of Gellius. "*Atque erat, qui diceret, legisse se in grammaticis commentariis P. Nigidii, saltem ex eo dictum, quod esset 'si aliter' idque ipsum dici solitum per defectionem, nam plenam esse sententiam 'si aliter non potest.' Sed id nos in isdem commentariis P. Nigidii, cum eos non, opinor, incuriose legissemus, nusquam invenimus.*" He goes on to state a very valid objection. "*Videntur autem verba ista 'si aliter non potest' a significatione quidem voculae huius, de qua quaerimus, non abhorрere. Set tot verba tamen in paucissimas litteras cludere, improbae cuiusdam subtilitatis est.*" Wharton, in his *Etyma Latina*, derives *saltem* from *saltus*, leaping, 'swiftly, without difficulty.' Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.*, p. 556, expresses himself more cautiously. "If *saltem* is Acc. Sg. of **salti*-, a leap, lit. 'with a leap,' 'swiftly, easily, assuredly,' it has taken *-tem* by analogy of *autem*, *item*, etc."

The derivation from *salutem* shows that *saltem* was the recognized form, while *saltim* is late. In fact, with so many adverbs in *-tim* as *partim*, *statim*, etc., it is hard to comprehend why an original *saltim* should have been changed to *saltem*. Therefor it seems to me that this connection with *salio* must be given up. The derivation from *si aliter*, as thus stated, cannot be correct, but why may not *saltem* stand for an earlier *si altem*, *altem* being a syncopated form for *alitem*, an adverb from the stem *ali-* formed after the analogy of *item*? The early Latin, as we know from Paulus, had an adverb, *aliuta*, which does not appear in literature. Why may it not have had *alitem* in the sense of 'other-

wise,' later supplanted by *aliter*? For the elision of *si* and the subsequent contraction, we may compare *sis*, *sultis*, and *sodes*. After the contraction took place, the derivation might easily have been forgotten, as it was in the case of *sirempse*, a word whose derivation is still in doubt. Whether *altem* or *alitem* was the original form of the adverb, I leave undecided. The analogy of *aliter* would favor *alitem*, and, according to F. Sommer, *I.F.* XI. 4, the pronoun *alter* goes back to an original **aliteros*. *Altem* would then be the syncopated Allegro form of *alitem*. Syncope was doubtless very common in the early period of the language, and it is a question whether we can safely lay down such definite laws governing its action as has been attempted by von Planta and Sommer. To trace the development of meaning by which *saltem* arrived at the force of 'at least' is not easy, as it already has that force in the earliest literature, and the ordinary speaker in the time of Plautus had entirely lost sight of its origin, but we may note that as we often find *sin aliter* opposed to *si*, so we often find *saltem* following a clause with *si*. Terence, *Hec.* 635 ff., has :

Ego, Pamphile, esse inter nos, si fieri potest,
Adfinitatem hanc sane perpetuam volo ;
Sin est ut aliter tua siet sententia,
Accipias puerum.

The latter proposition might have been abbreviated into *sin aliter*, *accipias puerum*, and we can see how *sin aliter* as an alternative might come to have the meaning of 'at least.' In Trin. 485,

Semper tu hoc facito, Lesbouice, cogites,
Id optumum esse tute uti sis optumus :
Si id nequeas, saltem ut optumis sis proxumus.

At an earlier period of the language we can conceive of *saltem*, 'if otherwise,' taking the place of the clause *si id nequeas*, but in the time of Plautus it had lost this force and had come to mean 'at least.' Compare, Ter. *Eun.* 639, *si illud non licet, saltem hoc licebit*, also *Amph.* 438, *Quis ego sum saltem, si non sum Sosia ?* *Cas.* 298, *Nam si sic nil impetrare potero, saltem sortiar.*

So in a sentence like Cic. *ad Att.* IX. 6, 5, *eripe mihi hunc dolorem aut minue saltem*, we can conceive that at an earlier period *saltem* had the force of 'if otherwise,' *i.e.* 'if you can't do that.' By the association of ideas after a time this might easily assume the meaning of 'at least.' Some dim appreciation of this earlier force seems to have been present to the author of the etymology when he interpreted *saltem* as '*si aliter non potest.*'

NOTE ON *frequenter*.

Fairclough, in his commentary on Ter. *And.* 107, *una aderat frequens*, says: "*frequens* used instead of the adverb *frequenter*, which belongs to later Latin." This is a natural mistake, as the dictionaries give no instance earlier than the *Auctor ad Herennium*, who uses it four times, IV. 32, 46, 48, and 56. But Cato, a contemporary of Terence, uses *frequenter* (*de Agr.* 67, 1, *oleum frequenter capiant*). Cato also uses *rarenter* once, *de Agr.* 103, and we know from Nonius that it was used by Livius Andronicus, Ennius, Caecilius, Pomponius, and Novius. Later it crops up again in Gellius, Apuleius, and Macrobius. Now I think *rarenter* must have been formed on the analogy of *frequenter*. It was not necessary, as the early language had *raro* and *rare*, but as *raro* and *crebro* were paired, so *rarenter* and *frequenter*. Of course *frequenter* would not be cited by the grammarians, not being for them an unusual word. Indeed it is one of the words which later supplants *saepe*. Compare my article on Latin Glossaries in Vol. XV. of the *Transactions*, p. 139. Plautus, of course, does not use *frequenter*. His usual word is *saepe*, and *crebro* occurs infrequently. So Plautus does not use *rarenter*, but does use *raro* and *rare*. *Frequenter* must have been known in the time of Lucilius, but does not occur in his fragments, but neither does *crebro* or *raro*, both of which are earlier than Lucilius. In fact *saepe* is only found five times in Lucilius and *saepius* twice. I believe that, if we had a larger body of early Latin prose, we should find that *frequenter* was in common use, and that *rarenter*, as I have already said, was formed on the analogy of *frequenter*.